

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional) 110466-152116
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</p> <p>on 05/17/2010</p> <p>Signature /Enoy Lawless/</p> <p>Typed or printed Enoy Lawless</p>		<p>Application Number 10/815,396</p> <p>Filed 03/31/2004</p> <p>First Named Inventor Christopher J. Lord</p> <p>Art Unit 2444</p> <p>Examiner Zhang, Shirley X.</p>

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.

assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

attorney or agent of record. 59,551  
Registration number \_\_\_\_\_

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 \_\_\_\_\_

/Yixiong Zou/

Signature

Yixiong Zou

Typed or printed name

(503) 222-9981

Telephone number

05/17/2010

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.  
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

\*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to be had by the USPTO to process an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Application of:

Christopher Lord et al.

Application No.: 10/815,396

Filed: March 31, 2004

Confirmation No.: 7579

For: CONTROLLING DEVICES ON AN  
INTERNAL NETWORK FROM AN  
EXTERNAL NETWORK

Examiner: Zhang, Shirley

Group Art Unit: 2444

Customer No.: 31817

Mail Stop Appeal  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Dear Sir:

In the Final Office Action dated February 17, 2010 ("Final Office Action"), claims of the above-captioned application were rejected for a second time. Applicants hereby appeal this decision of the Examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences according to 35 U.S.C. §134 and submit a Notice of Appeal in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §41.31 contemporaneously with the present request. Prior to the filing of the Appeal Brief, Applicants respectfully request that a panel of examiners formally review the legal and factual basis of the rejections in the above-captioned application in light of the remarks to follow.

**Remarks/Arguments**

**I. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 23 and 25-31 are pending. Claims 7, 10, 12-22, 24 and 32-37 are cancelled.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9, 11, 23 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,406,709 (hereinafter "Maher"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0035699 (hereinafter "Crosbie").

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher and Crosbie, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103898 (hereinafter “Moyer”).

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher and Crosbie, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217136 (hereinafter “Cho”).

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher and Crosbie, further in view of Cho and the article “UPnP Security Ceremonies Design document for UPnP Device Architecture 1.0” (hereinafter “Ellison”).

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher and Crosbie, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2005/0111382 (hereinafter “Le”).

## II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103

In rejecting claims 1-2, 5-6, 9, 11, 23 and 27-31 under § 103, the Examiner has failed to provide a sufficient factual basis to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness over Maher and Crosbie. In particular, no complete analysis supporting a finding of obviousness was provided, as further detailed below. *See* MPEP 2141.02.

In the Final Office Action, Maher was alleged to be teaching various recitations of claim 1, with the exception of the following recitations:

determining by the intermediary gateway, whether network traffic from the second device is corresponding to a previous secure communication session established when the second device was previously on the internal network, wherein the second device uses an address that is globally routable on the internal and the external networks and therefore said network traffic is valid with respect to the internal network; and

responding by the intermediary gateway, to said network traffic with an error and forcing the second device to re-establish a secure communication session from the external network.

To cure the deficiencies of Maher, the Examiner cited Fig. 1 and paragraph [0008] of Crosbie for teaching the above recitations of claim 1.

In the After-Final Response filed by Applicants on April 12, 2010, hereinafter “After-Final Response,” it was pointed out to the Examiner that paragraph [0008] of

Crosbie explicitly teaches “[i]f, however, the mobile device moves to an access point connected to another subnet … The mobile device would typically *be required to obtain a new IP address* and so break the previous connection.” *See* Crosbie, paragraph [0008], (emphasis added). As such, the cited portions of Crosbie contradicts with the recitation of “the second device uses an address that is *globally routable on the internal and external networks*” as recited in claim 1, (emphasis added).

In the Advisory Action mailed April 30, 2010, hereinafter “Advisory Action,” rather than providing any factual support to overcome the rebuttal evidence supplied in the After-Final Response, the Examiner simply stated her position as “Maher did not explicitly disclosed a combination of all the claim elements cited above, with ‘wherein the second device uses an address that is globally routable’ being one of the plurality of elements. Therefore, Applicant’s interpretation of Examiner’s statement is incorrect and Applicant’s argument based on such incorrect interpretation is unpersuasive.”

However, neither the Final Office Action nor the Advisory Action, set forth the relevant teaching of Maher relied upon by the Examiner for teaching or suggesting the recitation of “the second device uses *an address that is globally routable on the internal and the external networks*” as required by MPEP §§ 2141(v) and 706.02(j). And since the Examiner also failed to provide any factual evidence to show Crosbie teaches the aforementioned recitation of claim 1 in light of the After-Final Response, the aforementioned recitation of claim 1 cannot reasonably be said to be present in the asserted combination of Maher and Crosbie.

To support an obviousness rejection, MPEP §2143.03 requires “all words of a claim to be considered” and MPEP § 2141.02 requires consideration of the “[claimed] invention and prior art as a whole.” It remains well-settled law that an obviousness rejection requires at least a suggestion of all of the claim elements. In this case, the Examiner failed to provide any factual support to show that the combined references teach or suggest “the second device uses an address that is globally routable on the internal and the external networks” as recited in claim 1, in light of the rebuttal evidence submitted in the After-Final Response. Therefore, the Examiner failed to support the burden of *prima facie* obviousness in rejection of claim 1.

Independent claims 23 and 27 recite in general similar subject matter to claim 1. Claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, and 28-31 depend from one of the claims 1, 23 or 27, respectively, incorporating their respective recitations. Therefore, for at least the above stated reasons, the combination of Maher and Crosbie fails to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection for claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 23, 27 and 28-31 as well.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 25 and 26 depend on claims 1 and 23. And the additional references cited against claims 3, 4, 8, 25 and 26 fail to cure the deficiencies of Maher and Crosbie. Therefore, the rejections of claim 3, 4, 8 25 and 26 fails to support a *prima facie* obviousness rejection for similar reasons as previously discussed.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 05/17/2010

/Yixiong Zou/

Yixiong Zou  
Reg. No. 59,551

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-2000  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981